

Phunkulh, Bob

From: Sorrell, Eron
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2006 8:07 AM
To: Phunkulh, Bob
Subject: RE: 10041726

Bob, I'll get to it as soon as possible. I have to take them in the order I receive them.

-----Original Message-----

From: Phunkulh, Bob
Sent: Friday, March 17, 2006 7:25 AM
To: Sorrell, Eron
Cc: Huynh, Kim; Chin, Wellington
Subject: FW: 10041726

Eron,

Just following up on whether you have a chance look at the case since I have not receive any response from you.

Thanks,
Bob

-----Original Message-----

From: Huynh, Kim
Sent: Monday, March 13, 2006 9:28 AM
To: Sorrell, Eron
Cc: Phunkulh, Bob
Subject: FW: 10041726

Eron,

Please take a look at this transfer request when you have a chance. Thanks.

Kim

-----Original Message-----

From: Phunkulh, Bob
Sent: Tuesday, March 07, 2006 5:44 PM
To: Huynh, Kim
Subject: 10041726

I have a case that recently docketed to me which I think is more appropriate for class 365 or 711 or 710.

I have sent e-mails to class 365 and 711 (see below), but they think the case does not belong in their respective class.

I think the case may be appropriate in 710/22. The claims are directed toward accessing memory. Here is a copy of one of the independent claim.

Claim 8. An arbiter device for a multi-port memory equipped with a write-only first port and a read-only second port, comprising:

an identical address detection device, wherein the identical address detection device determines whether an input address to the write-only first port and an input address to the read-only second port are identical;

an operation stopping device, wherein the operation stopping device stops operation of the read-only

second port of the multi-port memory when the identical address detection device determines that the input address to the write-only first port and the input address to the read-only second port are identical; and

a selector device, wherein the selector device selects data and outputs data on the write-only first port of the multi-port memory when the identical address detection device determines that the input address to the write-only first port and the input address to the read-only second port are identical.

Please review the case and let me know what do you think. We do not have a place in Multiplexing Communication Class 370.

Thanks,
Bob A. Phunkulh
Primary Examiner
AU 2661

-----Original Message-----

From: Bragdon, Reginald
Sent: Wednesday, February 08, 2006 10:44 AM
To: Phunkulh, Bob
Subject: FW: 10/041726

Bob,

The invention is directed to a memory structure. The "detecting circuit" is just a comparator. The "operation stopping circuit" (107 in figure 1) appears to be a latch and an invertor. The "selector" 106 is a multiplexor. There is no significant data processing for class 711.

You may want to check with class 365 again and direct them to the structural elements and lack of data processing.

Reg

-----Original Message-----

From: Kim, Matt
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2006 11:49 AM
To: Bragdon, Reginald
Cc: Phunkulh, Bob
Subject: FW: 10/041726

Regi,

Please assist Bob with the tranfer inquiry when you have a chance.

Thanks
Matt

-----Original Message-----

From: Phunkulh, Bob
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 4:04 PM
To: Kim, Matt
Subject: 10/041726

Mr. Matt,

I have a case that recently docketed to me which I think is more appropriate for class 365 or 711. I sent an e-mail to class 365, but they think it more approriate for class 711 (see below).

The claims are directed toward arbitrating access to a memory.

Please review the case and let me know what do you think.

Thanks,

Bob A. Phunkulh
Primary Examiner
AU 2661

-----Original Message-----

From: Ho, Hoai
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 3:49 PM
To: Phunkulh, Bob
Subject: FW: 10/041726

try class 711 for memory access instead off class 365 for memory structure

-----Original Message-----

From: Zarabian, Amir
Sent: Monday, February 06, 2006 2:03 PM
To: Ho, Hoai
Subject: FW: 10/041726

-----Original Message-----

From: Phunkulh, Bob
Sent: Saturday, February 04, 2006 5:10 PM
To: Zarabian, Amir
Subject: 10/041726

Mr. Zarabian,

I have a case that recently docketed to me which I think is more appropriate for class 365.
The claims are directed toward arbitrating access to a memory.

Please review the case let me know what do you think.

Thanks,
Bob Phunkulh
Primary Examiner